arXiv:1606.02973v2 [math.PR] 10 Jun 2016

ayv_one_serv_gned_j-c.tex

On recurrence and availability factor for single–server system with general arrivals

A. Yu. Veretennikov*

June 14, 2016

Abstract

Recurrence and ergodic properties are established for a single–server queueing system with variable intensities of arrivals and service. Convergence to stationarity is also interpreted in terms of reliability theory.

1 Introduction

In the last decades, queueing systems generalising $M/G/1/\infty$, or $M/G/1$ (cf. [7]) – one of the most important queueing systems – attracted much attention, see [1] – [5], [9]. In this paper a single–server system similar to [10, 11] is considered, in which *intensities* of new arrivals as well as of their service may depend on the "whole state" of the system and the whole state includes the number of customers in the system – waiting and on service – *and* on the elapsed time of the last service, as well as on the elapsed time since the end of the last service. Batch arrivals are not allowed. The news in comparison to [10, 11] is that at any state, even if the system idle (no service), the intensity of new arrivals may depend on the time from the last end of service. The details of the system description will be formalised in the beginning of the next section. By the *m-availability factor* of the system we understand the probability of

*University of Leeds, UK; National Research University Higher School of Economics, and Institute for Information Transmission Problems, Moscow, Russia, email: a.veretennikov @ leeds.ac.uk.
The work was prepared within the framework of a subsidy granted to the HSE by the Government of the Russian Federation for the implementation of the Global Competitiveness Program, and supported by the RFBR grant 14-01-00319-a.

the idle state if $m = 0$, or probability of m customers in total on the server and in the queue. We do not use notation $G/G/1$ (or $GI/GI/1$) only because some conditions on intensities are assumed, which makes the model slightly less general. The problem addressed in the paper is how to estimate convergence rate of characteristics of the system including the m-availability factors to their stationary values.

The *elapsed* service time is assumed to be known at any moment, but the remaining service times for each customer are not. For definiteness, the discipline of serving is FIFO, although other disciplines may be also considered.

The paper consists of the Section 1 – Introduction, of the setting and main result in the Section 2, of the auxiliary lemmata in the Section 3 and of the short sketch of the proof of the main result in the Section 4.

2 The setting and main results

2.1 Defining the process

Let us present the class of models under investigation in this paper. Here the state space is a union of subspaces,

$$\mathcal{X} = \{(0, y) : \ y \geq 0\} \cup \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \{(n, x, y) : \ x, y \geq 0\}.$$

Functions of class $C^1(\mathcal{X})$ are understood as functions with classical continuous derivatives with respect to the variable x. Functions with compact support on $\mathcal{X}$ are understood as functions vanishing outside some domain bounded in this metric: for example, $C_0^1(\mathcal{X})$ stands for the class of functions with compact support and one continuous derivative. There is a generalised Poisson arrival flow with intensity $\lambda(X)$, where $X = (n, x, y)$ for any $n \geq 1$, and $X = (0, y)$ for $n = 0$. Slightly abusing notations, it is convenient to write $X = (n, x, y)$ for $n = 0$ as well, assuming that in this case $x = 0$. If $n > 0$, then the server is serving one customer while all others are waiting in a queue. When the last service ends, immediately a new service of the next customer from the queue starts. If $n = 0$ then the server remains idle until the next customer arrival; the intensity of such arrival at state $(0, y) \equiv (0, 0, y)$ may be variable depending on the value y, which stands for the elapsed time from the last end of service. Here n denotes the total number of customers in the system, and x stands for the elapsed time of the current service (except for $n = 0$, which

was explained earlier), and y is the elapsed from from the last arrival. *Normally*, intensity of arrivals depend on n and y, while intensity of service depends on n and x; however, we allow more general dependence. Denote $n_t = n(X_t)$ – the number of customers corresponding to the state X_t, and $x_t = x(X_t)$, the second component of the process (X_t), and $y_t = y(X_t)$, the third component of the process (X_t) (the third if $n > 0$)). For any $X = (n, x, y)$, intensity of service $h(X) \equiv h(n, x, y)$ is defined; it is also convenient to assume that $h(X) = 0$ for $n(X) = 0$. Both intensities λ and h are understood in the following way, which is a definition: on any nonrandom interval of time $[t, t + \Delta)$, conditional probability given X_t that the current service will *not* be finished and there will be no new arrivals reads,

$$\exp\left(-\int_0^\Delta (\lambda + h)(n_t, x_t + s, y_t + s)\, ds\right). \tag{1}$$

In the sequel, λ and h are assumed to be *bounded*. In this case, for $\Delta > 0$ small enough, the expression in (1) may be rewritten as

$$1 - \int_0^\Delta (\lambda + h)(n_t, x_t + s, y_t + s)\, ds + O(\Delta^2), \qquad \Delta \to 0, \tag{2}$$

and this what is "usually" replaced by

$$1 - (\lambda(X_t) + h(X_t))\Delta + O(\Delta^2).$$

However, in our situation, the latter replacement may be incorrect because of discontinuities of the functions λ and h. Emphasize that from time t and until the next jump, the evolution of the process X is *deterministic*, which makes the process *piecewise-linear Markov,* see, e.g., [7]. The (conditional given X_t) density of the moment of a new arrival *or* of the end of the current service after t at $x_t + z$, $z \geq 0$ equals,

$$(\lambda(n_t, x_t + z, y_t + z) + h(n_t, x_t + z, y_t + z)) \exp\left(-\int_0^\Delta (\lambda + h)(n_t, x_t + s, y_t + s))\, ds\right). \tag{3}$$

Further, given X_t, the moments of the next "candidates" for jumps up and down are conditionally independent and have the (conditional – given X_t) density, respectively,

$$\lambda(X_t + z) \exp\left(- \int_0^z \lambda(X_t + s)\, ds \right)$$

and (4)

$$h(X_t + z) \exp\left(- \int_0^z h(X_t + s)\, ds \right),\ z \geq 0.$$

(Here $X_t + s := (n_t, x_t + s, y_t + s)$.) Notice that (3) does correspond to conditionally independent densities given in (4).

2.2 Main result

Let

$$\Lambda := \sup_{n,x,y:\, n>0} \lambda(n, x, y) < \infty.$$

For establishing convergence rate to the stationary regime, we assume similarly to [10, 11],

$$\inf_{n>0,y} h(n, x, y) \geq \frac{C_0}{1 + x}, \quad x \geq 0. \tag{5}$$

We also assume a new condition related to $\lambda_0(t) = \lambda(0, 0, t)$, which was constant in the earlier papers: now it is allowed to be variable and satisfying

$$0 < \inf_{t \geq 0} \lambda_0(t) \leq \sup_{t \geq 0} \lambda_0(t) < \infty. \tag{6}$$

Recall that the process has no explosion with probability one due to the boundedness of both intensities, i.e., the trajectory may have only finitely many jumps on any finite interval of time.

Theorem 1 *Let the functions λ and h be Borel measurable and bounded and let the assumptions (5) and (6) be satisfied. Then, under the assumptions above, if C_0 is large enough, then there exists a unique stationary measure μ. Moreover, for any $m > k$, $C > 0$ there exists $\bar{C} > 0$ such that if $C_0 \geq \bar{C}$, then for any $t \geq 0$,*

$$\|\mu_t^{n,x,y} - \mu\|_{TV} \leq C\, \frac{(1 + n + x + y)^m}{(1 + t)^{k+1}}, \tag{7}$$

where $\mu_t^{n,x,y}$ is a marginal distribution of the process $(X_t,\, t \geq 0)$ with the initial data $X = (n, x, y) \in \mathcal{X}$.

Remark 1 *It is plausible that the bound in (7) may be improved so that the right hand side does not depend on y. Moreover, given all other constants, the value C in (7) may be made "computable", with a rather involved but explicit dependence on other constants. Moreover, it is likely that the condition (6) may be replaced by a weaker one,*

$$\frac{C_0'}{1+t} \le \lambda_0(t) \le \sup_{t\ge 0} \lambda_0(t) < \infty, \tag{8}$$

along with the assumption that C_0' is large enough. However, all these issues require a bit more accuracy in the calculus and we do not pursue these goals here leaving them until further publications with complete technical details.

3 Lemmata

Recall [6] that the generator of a Markov process $(X_t,\, t \ge 0)$ is an operator $\mathcal{G}$, such that for a sufficiently large class of functions f

$$\sup_X \lim_{t\to 0} \left\| \frac{E_X f(X_t) - f(X)}{t} - \mathcal{G} f(X) \right\| = 0 \tag{9}$$

in the norm of the state space of the process; the notion of generator does depend on this norm. An operator $\mathcal{G}$ is called a *mild generalised generator* (another name is extended generator) if (9) is replaced by its corollary (10) below called *Dynkin's formula*, or *Dynkin's identity* [6, Ch. 1, §3],

$$E_X f(X_t) - f(X) = E_X \int_0^t \mathcal{G} f(X_s)\, ds, \tag{10}$$

also for a wide enough class of functions f. We will also use the non-homogeneous counterpart of Dynkin's formula,

$$E_X \varphi(t, X_t) - \varphi(0, X) = E_X \int_0^t \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial s} \varphi(s, X_s) + \mathcal{G}\varphi(s, X_s) \right) ds, \tag{11}$$

for appropriate functions of two variables ($\varphi(t, X)$). Both (10) and (11) play a very important role in analysis of Markov models and under our assumptions may be justified similarly to [11]. Here X is a (non-random) initial value of the process. Both formulae (10)–(11) hold true for a large class of functions f, φ with $\mathcal{G}$ given by the standard expression,

$$\mathcal{G}f(X) := \frac{\partial}{\partial x} f(X) 1(n(X) > 0) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} f(X)$$

$$+\lambda(X)(f(X^+) - f(X)) + h(X)(f(X^-) - f(X)),$$

where for any $X = (n, x, y)$,

$$X^+ := (n+1, x, 0), \quad X^- := ((n-1) \vee 0, 0, y)$$

(here $a \vee b = \max(a, b)$). Under our minimal assumptions on regularity of intensities this may be justified similarly to [11].

Lemma 1 *If the functions λ and h are Borel measurable and bounded, then the formulae (10) and (11) hold true for any $t > 0$ for every $f \in C_b^1(\mathcal{X})$ and $\varphi \in C_b^1([0,\infty) \times \mathcal{X})$, respectively. Moreover, the process $(X_t,\, t \geq 0)$ is strong Markov with respect to the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t^X,\, t \geq 0)$.*

Further, let

$$L_m(X) = (n + 1 + x + y)^m, \quad L_{k,m}(t, X) = (1+t)^k L_m(X). \tag{12}$$

The extensions of Dynkin's formulae for some unbounded functions hold true: we will need them for the Lyapunov functions in (12).

Corollary 1 *Under the assumptions of the Lemma 1,*

$$L_m(X_t) - L_m(X) = \int_0^t \lambda(X_s) \Big[\big(L_m(X_s^{(+)}) - L_m(X_s) \big) \tag{13}$$

$$+h(X_s) \big(L_m(X_s^-) - L_m(X_s) \big) + 1(n(X_s) > 0) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} L_m(X_s) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} L_m(X_s) \Big]\, ds + M_t,$$

with some martingale M_t, and also

$$L_{k,m}(t, X_t) - L_{k,m}(0, X) = \int_0^t \big[\lambda(X_s) \big(L_{k,m}(s, X_s^{(+)}) - L_{k,m}(s, X_s) \big) \tag{14}$$

$$+h(X_s) \big(L_{k,m}(s, X_s^-) - L_{k,m}(s, X_s) \big) + \left(1(n(X_s) > 0) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \right) L_{k,m}(s, X_s) \Big]\, ds + \tilde{M}_t,$$

with some martingale $\tilde{M}_t$.

About a martingale approach in queueing models see, for example, [8]. The proof of the Lemma 1 is based on the next three Lemmata. The first of them is a rigorous statement concerning a well-known folklore property that probability of "one event" on a small nonrandom interval of length Δ is of the order $O(\Delta)$ and probability of "two or more events" on the same interval is of the order $O(\Delta^2)$. Of course, this is a common knowledge in queueing theory, yet for discontinuous intensities it has to be, at least, explicitly stated.

Lemma 2 *Under the assumptions of the Theorem 1, for any* $t \geq 0$,

$$P_{X_t}(\textit{no jumps on } (t, t+\Delta]) = \exp(-\int_0^\Delta (\lambda + h)(X_t + s)\, ds) \quad (= 1 + O(\Delta)), \tag{15}$$

$$P_{X_t}(\textit{at least one jump on } (t, t+\Delta]) = O(\Delta), \tag{16}$$

$$P_{X_t}(\textit{exactly one jump up \& no down on } (t, t+\Delta]) = \int_0^\Delta \lambda(X_t + s)\, ds + O(\Delta^2), \tag{17}$$

$$P_{X_t}(\textit{exactly one jump down \& no up on } (t, t+\Delta]) = \int_0^\Delta h(X_t + s)\, ds + O(\Delta^2), \tag{18}$$

and

$$P_{X_t}(\textit{at least two jumps on } (t, t+\Delta]) = O(\Delta^2). \tag{19}$$

In all cases above, $O(\Delta)$ *and* $O(\Delta^2)$ *are uniform with respect to* X_t *and only depend on the norm* $\sup_X(\lambda(X) + h(X))$*, that is, there exist* $C > 0$, $\Delta_0 > 0$ *such that for any* X *and any* $\Delta < \Delta_0$,

$$\limsup_{\Delta \to 0} \Big\{ \Delta^{-1} P_X(\textit{at least one jumps on } (0, \Delta]) + \Delta^{-2} P_X(\textit{at least two jumps on } (0, \Delta]) + \Delta^{-2} \left[P_{X_t}(\textit{one jump up \& no down on } (t, t+\Delta]) - \int_0^\Delta \lambda(X_t + s)\, ds \right] + \Delta^{-2} \left[P_{X_t}(\textit{one jump down \& no up on } (t, t+\Delta]) - \int_0^\Delta h(X_t + s)\, ds \right] \Big\} < C < \infty. \tag{20}$$

The next two Lemmata are needed for the justification that the process with discontinuous intensities is, indeed, strong Markov.

Lemma 3 *Under the assumptions of the Theorem 1, the semigroup* $T_t f(X) = E_X f(X_t)$ *is continuous in* t.

Lemma 4 *Under the assumptions of the Theorem 1 the process* $(X_t,\, t \geq 0)$ *is Feller, that is,* $T_t f(\cdot) \in C_b(\mathcal{X})$ *for any* $f \in C_b(\mathcal{X})$.

The proofs of all Lemmata may be performed similarly to [11].

4 Sketch of Proof of Theorem 1

The proof of convergence in total variation with rate of convergence repeats the calculus in [10] based on the Lyapunov functions $L_m(X)$ and $L_{k,m}(t, X)$ from (12), and on Dynkin's formulae (10) and (11) due to the Corollary 1. Without big changes, this calculus provides a polynomial moment bound

$$E_X \tau_0^k \leq C L_m(X) \leq C(n + 1 + x + y)^m, \tag{21}$$

for certain values of k and for the hitting time

$$\tau_0 := \inf(t \geq 0 :\ n_t = 0).$$

Namely, once the process attains the set $\{n = 0\}$, it may be successfully coupled with another (stationary) version of the same process at their joint jump $\{n = 0\} \mapsto \{n = 1\}$. This is because, in particular, immediately after such a jump the state of each process reads as $(1, 0, 0)$; in other words, this is a regeneration state. The news is only a wider class of intensities, which may be all variable (as well as discontinuous) including λ_0; however, this affects the calculus only a little, once it is established that (10) and (11) hold true, because this calculus involves only time values $t < \tau_0$. (Some change will be in the procedure of coupling, though.) In turn, the inequality (21) provides a bound for the rate of convergence, for the justification of which rate there are various approaches such as versions of coupling as well as renewal theory. Convergence of probabilities in the definition of m-availability factors is a special case of a more general convergence in total variation. We drop further details, which will be specified in a further publication.

References

[1] *Asmussen, S.,* Applied Probability and Queues, 2nd edition, Springer, Berlin et al. (2003).

[2] *Bambos, N., Walrand, J.,* On stability of state-dependent queues and acyclic queueing networks, Adv. Appl. Probab. 21(3) (1989), 681–701.

[3] *Borovkov, A. A., Boxma, O. J., Palmowski, Z.,* On the Integral of the Workload Process of the Single Server Queue, Journal of Applied Probability, 40(1) (2003), 200–225.

[4] *Bramson, M.,* Stability of Queueing Networks, École d'Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XXXVI-2006, Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 1950 (2008).

[5] *Fakinos, D.,* The Single-Server Queue with Service Depending on Queue Size and with the Preemptive-Resume Last-Come-First-Served Queue Discipline, Journal of Applied Probability, 24(3) (1987), 758–767.

[6] *Dynkin, E. B.,* Markov processes, V. I, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Göttingen-Heidelberg (1965).

[7] *Gnedenko, B. V., Kovalenko, I. N.,* Introduction to queueing theory. 2nd ed., rev. and suppl. Boston, MA et al., Birkhäuser (1991).

[8] *R. Sh. Liptser, A. N. Shiryaev,* Stochastic calculus on filtered probability spaces, in: S. V Anulova, A. Yu. Veretennikov, N. V Krylov, R. Sh. Liptser, A. N. Shiryaev, Stochastic calculus, Itogi Nauki i Tekhniki, Modern problems of fundamental math. directions, Moscow, VINITI (1989), 114–159 (in Russian); Engl. transl.: Probability Theory III, Stochastic Calculus, Yu. V. Prokhorov and A. N. Shiryaev Eds., Springer (1998), 111–157.

[9] *Thorisson, H.,* The queue $GI/G/1$: finite moments of the cycle variables and uniform rates of convergence, Stoch. Proc. Appl. 19(1) (1985), 85–99.

[10] *Veretennikov, A. Yu.,* On the rate of convergence to the stationary distribution in the single-server queuing system, Autom. Remote Control 74(10), 1620-1629 (2013).

[11] *Veretennikov, A.Yu., Zverkina, G.A.,* Simple Proof of Dynkin's formula for Single-Server Systems and Polynomial Convergence Rates, Markov Processes Relat. Fields, 20, 479-504 (2014).